

Appl. No. 10/605,653
Amdt. dated May 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 23, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1, 6 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adachi et al. (US 6,561,633):

5 **Response:**

Claim 1:

Adachi teaches a plane-like lighting unit, however, he fails to teach some limitations of claim 1. The applicant explains as follows:

10 First, Adachi uses a light unit comprising a plurality of linear or bar-shaped light source (Fig.1, col.4, lines 30-35), but claim 1 teaches using a plurality of point light source generators.

In addition, Adachi teaches forming light diffusing reflection means 15 300(Fig.1 300, column 8, lines 33-50) on the reverse side of the light-guiding plate. However, the light diffusing reflection means 300 is a coating layer e.g. white pigment ink formed on the surface of the light-guiding plate, which is different from the scattering particles of claim 1 disposed inside the diffusing plate.

20

Furthermore, the semi-transmitting reflection means 600 (Fig.1 600, column 8, line 54-column 9, line 30) is not a pattern, but the scattering pattern of claim 1 is a pattern.

25 Moreover, Adachi merely discloses a plurality of grooves to accommodate the light sources, but he fails to teach that the scattering apertures are trapezoidal-shaped, and the trapezoidal apertures are

Appl. No. 10/605,653
Amtd. dated May 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 23, 2006

corresponding to the point light source generators.

Thus, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Adachi's teaching, and should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 1 is therefore requested.

5

Claim 6:

Claim 6 has been cancelled.

Claims 11-13:

10 Claims 11-13 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 11-13 is therefore requested.

Claim 17:

15 Claim 17 includes all the limitations recited in claim 1 that can distinguish from Adachi's teaching. In addition, the amended claim 17 also includes the limitation "the scattering patterns are different patterns". This limitation finds support in original claim 16 for instance, and no new matter is introduced. Adachi does not teach this limitation, and therefore 20 claim 17 should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 17 is politely requested.

2. Rejection of claims 1, 6, 9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang (US 4,714,983) in view of Konno (JP 25 06-94920A):

Response:

Claim 1:

Appl. No. 10/605,653
Amdt. dated May 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 23, 2006

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "the scattering aperture is trapezoidal in shape" is added to claim 1. This limitation finds support in original claim 6 and Fig.5, for instance, and no new matter is introduced.

5

Lang only teaches that cavity 42 is rectangular in shape, and both Lang and Konno fail to teach or suggest that the scattering aperture is trapezoidal in shape. Thus, the amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited arts, and should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 1 is 10 therefore requested.

Claim 6:

Claim 6 has been cancelled.

15 Claims 9 and 13-15:

Claims 9 and 13-15 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 9 and 13-15 is therefore requested.

20 **3.Rejection of claims 11-12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang (US 4,714,983) in view of Konno (JP 06-94920A) as applied to claim 1 and 14, and further in view of Pelka et al. (US 6,134,092):**

25 **Response:**

Claims 11-12:

Claims 11-12 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 11-12 is therefore

Appl. No. 10/605,653
Amdt. dated May 21, 2006
Reply to Office action of February 23, 2006

requested.

Claim 16:

Pelka teaches that the diffusive reflective material on the top surface 57 and the side surface 65 may comprise a coating of one or more layers of diffusely reflective tape (Figs.3-4, col.4, lines 37-54). However, the diffusive reflective material is a coating material, and it is different from the scattering pattern of claim 16. Specifically, the scattering patterns are structural patterns, and claim 16 teaches that the scattering patterns may have different structures. Therefore, claim 16 is distinct from Pelka's teaching, and should be allowed.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 05.21.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

20 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

25 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)